

Docket No. 98-417A
PATENT APPLICATION

I certify that on the date specified below this correspondence is being transmitted to Examiner Ann M. McCamey via facsimile 703-308-7722.

Date

Ann K. Galbraith

October 24, 2002

Okt 24

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: LAZARO, et al. Group Art Unit: 2833

Application No.: 09/955,834 Examiner: Ann M. McCamey

Filing Date: September 18, 2001 Docket No.: 98-417A

Date: October 24, 2002

For: AIRCRAFT GROUND POWER CONNECTOR

Box: Amendment

FAX COPY RECEIVED

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

OCT 24 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

RESPONSE

Sir:

In response to the Office action dated April 24, 2002 (Paper No. 4), please reconsider the above-identified application in view of the following amendments and remarks.

11/04/2002 SDAVIS 0000004 022960 09955834
01 FC:1253 IN THE CLAIMS
920.00 CH

Claim 4 has been amended as follows:

A'

4. The connector of claim 3 wherein the releasable fastener includes a screw positioned within the connector that, when screwed into the connector, pushes against a layer of insulating material within the connector that it cannot penetrate, to facilitate separation of the layers of the connector and permit its removal from the male electrical pin on the aircraft exterior.

Docket No. 98-417A
PATENT APPLICATION

REMARKS

Support for this amendment may be found in Figure 1, the original wording of claim 4, and in the specification at page 10, lines 1-4. This amendment does not add any new matter and its entry is respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertsch (US 4,500,150) in view of Chase et al. (US 4,973,272). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

35 USC §112, second paragraph

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. More specifically, the Examiner states that Claim 3 is objected to because it recites the limitation "the force" without proper antecedent basis. Applicants believe that there is no need to recite an antecedent basis for this term, because it refers to a property of the connector. What's being compared in claim 3 is the force required to disconnect the connector of the invention from the fixed connector located on the aircraft, with the force required to disconnect the connector of the invention from the ground power supply connector. When a pulling force or weight of the ground power cable is applied to pull on the assembly of the three connectors, the force should act to disconnect the ground power cable first, so that the connector of the invention stays attached to the aircraft. It is believed that this is sufficiently clear from the claims as worded. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner also objects to the use of the term "removal is achieved" in claim 4. It is believed that the amendment to claim 4 obviates this rejection. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.